Response to Comments - November 3, 2003 CEQA Scoping Meeting:

#	Comment	Commenter	LARWQCB Response
1	Who were the members on the TAC?	Kris Flaig - City of LA	Members are listed in an appendix to the Staff Report.
2	How were the members chosen?	Kris Flaig - City of LA	Members are fish experts from academia and various government agencies.
3	Will there by a description in the Staff Report on the TAC objectives?	Jim Marchese - City of LA	Yes.
4	What is the timeline of the proposed basin plan amendment?	Jim Marchese - City of LA	The Regional Board staff plans to take this amendment to the Board on January 29, 2003.
5	Will the result of the National Consultation between US Fish and Wildlife Service and US EPA be considered prior to taking this item to the Board?	Jim Marchese - City of LA	The conclusion of the consultation will most likely not occur before the Board hears this item. If the findings of the consultation are that EPA's recommended criteria are protective of fish and wildlife, the consultation should have no effect on the proposed amendment. If, on the other hand, the consultation necessitates a revision in EPA's recommended 304(a) criteria, EPA will most likely issue revised recommendations or additional guidance to ensure that the recommended criteria are protective of fish and wildlife. Under this scenario, the result of the consultation may affect the policies implemented as a result of this amendment.

#	Comment	Commenter	LARWQCB Response
6	Is there geographical documentation or a narrative description of the water bodies to which POTWs discharge?	Jim Marchese - City of LA	The water bodies are specified by reach. Reaches are defined in the Basin Plan.
7	Are the Upper LA River and Tujunga Wash listed as having winter spawning and ELS species?	Gus Dembegiofes - City of LA	Yes.
8	How complete and final are the surveys?	Shahrouzeh Saneie - City of LA	At the time of the Scoping meeting, Regional Board staff was still awaiting some survey responses. The name of each respondent will be included in the staff report.
9	Would this amendment change the ELS absent or present status of water bodies as specified by the ammonia basin plan amendment that was implemented in July 2003? If so, the LA River is currently considered ELS absent and the change in status to ELS present would mean more stringent offluent limits for	Shahrouzeh Saneie - City of LA	The amendment would change the ELS status of water bodies that was originally specified in the ammonia basin plan amendment that was implemented in July 2003. Regarding the impact such a change would have on waste load allocations (WLAs) in the LA River TMDL, Regional Board staff would assess
	would mean more stringent effluent limits for permittees discharging to the LA River. The LA River TMDL for nitrogen and its effects has a reopener provision.		ambient water quality to determine whether the current WLAs were sufficient to meet the chronic ammonia objectives based on the ELS present condition. If water quality standards were met, no change to the WLAs in the TMDL would be necessary. If water quality standards were not met, the WLAs would need to be adjusted to achieve the chronic objective based on the ELS present condition.

Revising the Early Life Stage Provision of the July 2003 Ammonia Objectives for Protection of "Aquatic Life"

#	Comment	Commenter	LARWQCB Response
10	Are the studies and references used to determine where ELS spawn consolidated into one document that can be reviewed?	Kris Flaig - City of LA	They will be referenced in the Staff Report Reference section and the full references will be available in our office.
11	If someone wants to present the information to support that a water body should be designated ELS absent, is this an Executive Officer or a Regional Board action?	Kris Flaig - City of LA	Such a change would need to go through the basin plan amendment process, since it is ultimately changing the objective for that water body.